DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 441 FL 009 643

AUTHOR Ornstein, Jacob
TITLE The Tagmemic Model and Language Variation.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 29p.; Extract from "Linguistics at the Crossroads," Jupiter Press, P.O. Box 101, Lake Bluff, Illinois 60044

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Dialect Studies; Language Attitudes; *Language Classification; Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Styles; Language Typology; Language Usage; *Language Variation; *Linguistic Borrowing; Literature Reviews; Regional Dialects; *Sociolinguistics; Spanish; *Tagmemic Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a tentative notational or marking system which attempts to provide more information on the sociolinguistic constraints upon the use of linguistic features than has been the case in other systems. A review of other studies in language variation, particularly those of William Labov, suggests that much can be done toward interpreting and predicting the types of speech variation with more explicit knowledge of both the situational context and the actors. Research in language styles, attitudes, usage and lexicography shows a tendency to regard data in the light of the linguistic continuum and relevant sociolinguistic dimensions. The proposed notational system is presented under the headings of symbol, explanation and markedness. The pattern followed is a digraphemic one and the inventory of 50 items includes several dimensions that intersect with other areas. Through the use of 34 examples in Spanish, the tentative marking system is then applied at the clause, phrase and word levels. This implementation of the marking system suggests that it may exhibit the potential of providing much of the linguistic and extra-linguistic information needed to interpret changes in progress and their direction. Some discussion of implications for further investigation concludes the essay. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165441

THE TAGMEMIC MODEL AND LANGUAGE VARIATION

JACOB ORNSTEIN

Estratto da:
Linguistics at the crossroads

FL009643

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Makkai UB Makkai
Luigi Heilmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

LIVIANA EDITRICE - JUPITER PRESS
1977

THE TAGMEMIC MODEL AND LANGUAGE VARIATION

Jacob Ornstein

A. *Prefatory remarks.* The gratifying inclusion of separate tagmemic and stratificational sections at the XIth International Congress of Linguists, held August 28-Sept. 2, 1972, at Bologna, Italy, represented positive reassurance of the vigor of the respective models, along with European and others, in this day of competing and conflicting theories of linguistics.[1] At the same Congress, the writer had occasion to address himself to problems of linguistic variation and its analog, language change, and to point out that despite the anthropological linguistic orientation of tagmemics, whose practicioners are unusually close to multilingual contact points in numerous countries, they have concerned themselves surprisingly little with language change per se. As this was not refuted by fellow-tagmemicists in the ensuing periods, it would appear that there is good reason to pursue the topic within the tagmemic framework. More positively, furthermore, in private conversations with tagmemicists, there was, if not total agreement, at least no major objection to my viewpoint, whatever other difference may have existed.

Similarly in this paper, although there will be some discussion of approaches to language variation by other models, the main thrust will be our proposal for a tentative notational system for marking variants, frankly programmatic in nature. At the same time some examples of its application at various tagmemic levels will be offered. Beyond this, it is hoped that frank criticism and discussion will be stimulated.

Tagmemics itself developed under the original name of 'grammemics' or 'gramemics', out of Bloomfieldian structural linguistics, mainly under the influence of Kenneth Pike, but with contributions by other pioneers such as Charles Fries. By now it is becoming well enough known that space need not be wasted on presenting its basic concepts. Its vigor is attested by the rather rich flourishing of tendencies

[1]Appreciation must be expressed to the University of Texas at El Paso Research Institute, the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, Austin, Texas, and the Spencer Foundation of Chicago, all of which contributed materially to making possible our program of Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism, now under the Cross-Cultural Southwest Ethnic Study Center, whose corpus was utilized in this paper. Moreover, sincerest gratitude must also go to the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C., for the opportunity to prepare this study in greater depth than might have been possible without the Senior Fellowship awarded me for 1971-72. Individuals who made useful suggestions include: Glenn G. Gilbert, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Garland Bills, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; Jack S. Bailey, University of Texas at El Paso; and a number of others impossible to mention here. A previous version of this paper was given at the XIth International Congress of Linguists, Bologna, Aug. 28-Sept. 2, 1972.

within the school itself.

As pointed out in the aforementioned Bologna paper, the main trends in tagmemics today are the following:

1. A behavioristic approach by Pike, concentrating upon language as it relates to the sociocultural components of verbal output and the dynamics of speech acts.
2. A generative approach of a surface-to-surface type by Longacre (1968, 1970) as well as a similar one by Liêm.
3. A cognitive model being developed by Blansitt (1972) and based on the three hierarchies of phonology, grammar, and semology.
4. An orientation toward Fillmore's case grammar by Cook (1969) and Wise (1972).
5. A formulation by Peter Fries (1971, 1972) concerned with a more explicit theory of surface and 'shallow' grammar in order to better approach deep structure.

While the literature of tagmemics is by now quite voluminous, little of it appears to attempt to account explicitly for language variation, obviously taken for granted. At the same time, a model so noted for its ability to provide effective taxonomies useful for carrying out deeper analyses, ought, it would seem, to participate more fully in the general movement of linguistic models to examine variability with a view to its implications for linguistic change and related phenomena.

Accordingly, the remainder of this paper will be concerned with variation as viewed by linguists within other schools as well as with our sociolinguistic notational system for marking variants. While admittedly this occurs at a surface level, such a taxonomy, it appears to us, has implications for deeper levels as well.

B. *Language variation as a concern of linguistics and related fields.* It is not possible within our scope to review and do justice to the relevant views of such pioneers as Schuchardt, Meillet, and De Saussure, which have been discussed elsewhere by Labov (1966) and Bailey (1971).

The fact is that language variation as a topic appears never to have received as much explicit and systematic treatment as recently. While notable exceptions can be found to this, the statement is basically valid, it seems to us. The interest has been heightened by the flowering of the study of bilingualism as a serious scholarly pursuit by linguists, psychologists and other social scientists, and by the emergence of sociolinguistics and its intense interest in describing how speech varies according to the social groups employing it, or more precisely, patterned variation.

Within linguistics itself, both in America and elsewhere, the focus has been in the past upon homogeneity of form, or homogeneity of surface realization, rather than the opposite. American structuralists at least felt that they had their hands full in treating even one variety of a language, and that this logically should be the speech of the 'educated native speaker', and, in many cases, the linguist himself! Despite this, of course, incidental treatments of variability are not lacking.

At first the emergence of Chomsky's generative-transformational grammar

appeared not to bode well for interest also in linguistic variation. He and his 'school' addressed themselves to the standard variety of a language exemplified by educated native speakers. Somewhat less than ten years ago he wrote:

> Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly (1965:3).

As it has developed, however, the very preoccupation of generativists with grammaticality and well-formedness has engendered concern as well with those utterances which are not completely 'acceptable' for various reasons. At the same time the recent anti-poverty drives and the involvement of linguists with the 'social dialects' of the ghetto have motivated the former to examine low-prestige vernaculars which would not have been legitimate objects of scholarly concern a few years ago. Accordingly a number of transformationalists are now prominent in serious investigations of Black English and other non-standard vernaculars, producing studies on variation in abundance.

Undoubtedly the best known of these is William Labov, a former student of the late Uriel Weinreich, inspired by the latter to undertake studies of language divergence. Their hypothesis was that language change could be studied synchronically, that is, while it was taking place, and that the phenomena of language variation provided an excellent, if not the best, vantage-point for doing so. This, of course, went counter to the Neo-Grammarian belief, perpetuated until recently by linguists, that it was only possible to do so diachronically, or historically.

Labov's work is by now too well known to need introduction, but his investigations mostly of the English of varied social classes, and including that of Blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Whites, resulted in statistical evidence that language variation, rather than being merely idiolectal, or in 'free variation', is on the contrary ordered and rule-governed. Believing that, despite theoretical differences, the Chomskian framework was still the most effective, Labov proceeded to equip this model for dealing with variation. As a result of this, he has introduced two fundamental concepts, that of the ***linguistic*** or ***sociolinguistic variable*** and the ***variable rule*** (1970).

Of primary importance is that Labov questions the validity of the idealized native speakers as the primary source for elicitation, advocating the examination of vernacular samples elicited from small groups in as natural a context as possible by peer group interviewers. A large battery of measures are applied (mostly orally), including attitudinal queries. Also employing statistical procedures, he has been able to demonstrate the systematic patterning of speech along the dual dimensions of socio-economic status and style (casual speech, careful speech, word list reading, minimal pair reading) to have high correlation with linguistic phenomena or variations. Hence, speech output (and its graphemic analog) is a function of the type of groups who produce it so that the two components, one linguistic and the other societal, are embedded in the term 'sociolinguistics'. There should be no need of this latter term, it is felt, once the social dimension is duly taken into consideration within linguistics itself.

A sizable 'school' of sociolinguists following Labov's 'variable model' now

exists. Incidentally, their writings, particularly as they concern the nature and application of Black English in the school system, have excited a great deal of scholarly and public controversy. At any rate, a large number of the Labovian sociolinguists are concentrated in the Washington, D. C., area, including such figures as Roger Shuy, Ralph Fasold, Walter Wolfram, Joan Baratz, Orlando Taylor, and others quite well known.

Of significance as regards further developments is the activity of Charles-James Bailey (1970) at Georgetown University, and various associates. In collaboration with Weinreich, Marvin Herzog, and William Labov, the former has elaborated his 'wave model' of speech variation in an endeavor to accord much fuller recognition to the dimensions of time and space. He utilizes variants to indicate ongoing linguistic changes, by plotting the forms along vertical and horizontal cells in grids, according to their clustering by geographical area and the chronology of their change or persistance.

A member of the 'post-generative' generation, Bailey has frequently attacked unitary-type grammars, recommending instead 'polylectal' or 'panlectal' ones (he employs ***lect*** and ***isolect*** in place of dialect). In addition, he pleads for the inclusion of both the diasynchronic and diachronic dimensions, as well as of pertinent non-linguistic data on the constraints of language usage to help explain the patterning of the variations (1971:1-31). Of value, also, is his informative survey of the recent work of such generative semanticists as Karttunen, the Lakoff's, McCawley, Carden, Postal, and Ross, as it relates to language variation. At the same time, he discusses the role of such scholars as Schuchardt, De Saussure, Meillet, Martinet, as well as Jakobson and other members of the Prague school, not failing to offer a long-overdue appreciation of the insights of these European pioneers.

Post-structuralists or Neo-structuralists active in so many phases of language variation include particularly social dialectologists such as McDavid whose recent work reflects a greater emphasis on the correlation of linguistic and social factors.

The works of Joshua Fishman have helped to bring about a symbiotic relationship between linguistics and the social sciences. Among his fundamental concepts is the importance of linking a social domain with language choice and usage, as well as his notion of 'interactional sociolinguistics' (1970:37-56). Likewise, Hymes (1962; 1967), an anthropologist, has provided an 'ethnography of speaking' model, in which a correlation between speech setting and the speech output occupies an important place.

It is impossible here even to mention the work of other anthropologists, psycholinguists, and sociolinguists whose research has implications for our theme. A promising study is that of 'ethnomethodology', still in its infancy, but being pursued by such social scientists as Goffman (1972), Sacks (1969), Schegloff (1968), and Garfinkel (1968). Their focus upon the total conversational situation and the interaction occurring, still poorly comprehended today, have obvious implications for explaining some of the rationale of language variation, beyond socio-economic status and similar variables. A psychologist, Leon Jakobovits, has directed attention to the 'syntax of conversational interaction', drawing upon the research of the above scholars in such works as his *Preliminaries to the Psychology of Ordinary Language* (1971).

Meanwhile, signalling a sort of liberation from the supposed anti-mentalist strictures of classic Bloomfieldian structuralism, feverish concern is being evinced by linguists for a wide spectrum of psychological, sociological, and even ecological aspects of the speech situation. As long as human nature is as it is, there will always be in operation arbitrary and ephemeral factors, best describable as idiosyncratic and unpredictable.

Aside from this, however, as Labov and others in effect suggest, much can be done toward interpreting, and even predicting the types of speech variation which may be expected if one but has a more explicit knowledge of the characteristics of both the situational context and the actors.

Meanwhile, as suggested earlier, tagmemics itself has remained largely at the margin of studies on language variation. In truth, however, it ought to be pointed out that almost a quarter century ago Charles Fries and Kenneth Pike (1949) conceived of the 'coexistence of systems'. Ten years or so later Pike, in his article 'Toward a Theory of Change and Bilingualism' (1960), viewed the two languages spoken by a bilingual as contrastive systems, with each constituting a 'hypersystem' composed of varying styles at the core and with the bilingual along the margins, yet operating within a single culturo-linguistic matrix. Unhappily, neither of these formulations was elaborated upon.

In Pike's *Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* (1968, but published in three installments in the 1950's), the author presents a highly stimulating and detailed exegesis of a behavioristic approach to tagmemics. Like Hymes he appears to feel that human behavior can be as explicitly patterned in 'structures' as can the components of language. This was a significant development, apparently little practiced by tagmemicists themselves.

Pike, at least implicitly, suggests how variability might be handled within this model. For instance, in his analysis of behavior, he recommends the use of an 'S-tagmemic slot' which would be a slot, position or status (status-slot) in some type of organized group of people. The immediate 'filler' of the S-slot might then be Mr. John Jones, handyman in the small southern town of Williams' Corners, who would reflect the abstracted set of personal, professional and language characteristics of that status-class of handymen throughout the American South and, to some extent, the entire United States (1967:647-59).

The fact is, however, that such formulations expressed by Pike in the above magnum opus, are still not as well known among fellow-linguists as are his earlier work on tagmemic clause-types and on general phonology and tone languages. Indeed the role that tagmemics might play in analyzing variation remains inchoate and ill-defined. In reviewing the proceedings of the 1967 Second International Seminar on the Description and Measurement of Bilingualism, Meyerstein (1970) notes that Berthe Siertsema, one of the participants, had queried why Pike or another representative of his school had not been invited to explain how language variation would be handled in a 'unified theory of human behavior'.

It would, nevertheless, appear to us quite simply that until tagmemicists

attack the problem through various formulations, and make these known to the scholarly public, the situation will change little from the present status. Accordingly, the notational system to be presented below is nothing more than one type of possible approach, albeit at the surface levels; many others are possible within the tagmemic framework.

C. *A proposed sociolinguistic notational system.* Our interest here is principally in a marking system which would provide more information on the sociolinguistic constraints upon the use of linguistic features or items than has been the case heretofore, because of 'unitary' attitudes toward language. By its very nature, as it were, it will be largely etic, and applicable to languages in general, although emic or language-particular markings are by no means out of the question.

At this point, it must be admitted that the problem has been approached indirectly many times before whenever judgments have been made regarding the appropriateness or acceptability of linguistic forms. Much of this, nevertheless, has been grammatical and lexicographic activity, excluding all but formally sanctioned 'elitist' choices.

Coming closer to the issue have been certain aspects of the work of sociolinguists. Ferguson (1962*a*, 1962*b*) has devised a scale for assessing the degree of standardization of languages while his diglossia concept establishes a High (H) vs. Low (L) dichotomy. In this, highly differentiated forms of the same language exist, as in Greece, one for formal and the other for informal domains (Ferguson 1959). Stewart's revised scheme (1968) classifies languages and language varieties according to both their nature and their function. The system is based on one-letter designations, such as *u* for 'vernacular', *p* for 'pidgin', *c* for 'creole', *a* for 'artificial' and the like.

Efforts to describe the various styles or codes within a given language have been made by Joos (1962) and others. Halliday (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens 1964) speaks of language 'registers', while Gumperz (1967) conceived of the 'linguistic repertoire', as including all styles controlled by a speaker. Labov divides all styles into: (1) careful, (2) casual, (3) reading, (4) word lists, with a fifth consisting of minimal pair reading, mainly used, as are (3) and (4), in the elicitation process. Ivić has described a scale going from 0 to 100%, measuring relative mastery of standard language vs. local dialect and which to a certain extent takes into consideration code-switching and similar factors (1966).

It appears to us that perhaps the most thorough review of systems attempting to characterize the position and functions of individual languages is available in Haugen 1971. In this, furthermore, he shows how one may use relevant sociolinguistic dimensions, utilizing the device of binary opposition. For instance, among Norwegian immigrants investigated by him, certain topics, occasions and interlocutors would demand the use of English for prestige purposes, hence this would be characterized as: +status and -intimacy. By contrast (presumably among the first generation), casual and intimate situations would require Norwegian, which would then be marked: +intimacy and -status.

Although speculation regarding the dimensions of grammatical acceptability and its analog, well-formedness are in the broad sense relevant, we must limit ourselves to more explicit systems. In this connection, the supposition by theoreticians that educated native speakers unfailingly generate utterances of unquestionable acceptability appears not to be supported by the facts. Labov (1970:38), not finding an impressive degree of categorical agreement among his subjects, has experimented with a three-point scale in which *1* is ungrammatical, *2* is intermediate and *3* is perfectly grammatical.

A considerable literature has by now accumulated in the work of various sociolinguists, psycholinguists and speech specialists on language attitudes, part of which touches upon standardness vs. non-standardness. This includes self-evaluation and classroom correction tests, again by Labov and associates (1968:4), and similar attitudinal tests by Williams (1970).

Unhappily, however, for most languages of the world, scientific surveys of language usage simply do not exist, and intuition still remains the most common criterion.

On the positive side, nevertheless, various types of usage surveys are to be noted in English and a few other languages. Quirk and Svartvik in *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability* (1966) avoid questions of authoritativeness and merely approach the issue by 'tests' in which respondents react to whether they accept a given item as appropriate or not.

Other studies include the British Survey of English, concerned mostly with grammar, as well as one at Brown University, by now embracing about a million running occurrences of American English lexical items (Householder 1969). A project aiming at a Dictionary of American Regional English, begun by Frederic G. Cassidy, University of Wisconsin, has, through oral and written questionnaires, already canvassed over a thousand communities in this country. In general, dialect studies are reflecting an increasingly more sociolinguistic trend, yet their results must be utilized with proper precautions.

An encouraging trend at present as regards grammatical propriety is the tendency to regard data in the light of the linguistic continuum, whose significance has been constantly urged by Shuy and others, as we have noted above. Not many years ago in his Presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America, Hill took issue with the test of grammaticality as supreme arbiter and suggested that investigators like Quirk and Svartvik may be on safer ground in their exploration of the principle of gradience rather than one of dichotomous polarity.

Lexicographers have also begun to go beyond traditionally prescriptive authorities, turning to a variety of persons in communication fields. The compilers of the *American Heritage Dictionary*, for example, appointed committees of judges as Usage Panels to determine most desirable or appropriate choices of lexical items through consensus (Bishop 1969). In regard to 'standardness', Hoss (1969) recognizes the relativity and tenuousness of the concept, and in discussing variants, in the introduction to the dictionary, he in effect treats speech styles as a sociolinguistic dimension.

The labelling system, incidentally, utilized the following special categories: non-standard or informal, slang, vulgar, obsolete, archaic, rare, poetic, regional, British, foreign language. More or less arbitrary variants are simply introduced by 'also'.

For Spanish, the problems of assigning or assessing sociolinguistic status are considerably more thorny than for English. At the same time, although the 'authoritativeness' of the Royal Spanish Academy in Madrid is often treated with levity, it does constitute, as it were, a supreme arbiter for the prescriptive codes throughout the entire Spanish-speaking world. Aside from this, there is a network of national academies passing upon usage within a given country, although their influence dare not be over-emphasized. A good picture of the situation, and the often ambiguous interrelations, may be seen in Guitarte and Torres (1968). Incidentally, it is relevant to note that in a recent dictionary of Bolivianisms (Fernández and Fernández, 1967), the appendix includes a list of lexical items approved by the Academy in Madrid, as well as another of vocabulary 'not yet approved'.

In this same connection, although the French Academy has long had the image of probably the most authoritative arbiter of usage in the world, the fact is that the Spanish counterparts appear less prone to be liberal in practice. The former, indeed, publishes periodic lists of permitted features called *tolérances*, in recognition of the 'informal authority' of widespread and high-frequency usage by all social classes. A case in point here would be the relaxation of the well-known prescriptive rule calling for deletion of the indefinite article in negative partitive constructions, such as *je n'ai pas du vin* rather than *je n'ai pas de vin.*

The fact is, however, that most of the Luso-Hispanic world lies heavily under the prescriptive tradition, in which the influence of written 'authorities' is still great. Although a younger generation of scholars with modern training is emerging in Spain, Colombia, Peru, Mexico and Puerto Rico, as well as Portuguese-speaking Brazil, prescriptivism dies hard. By contrast, a certain amount of attention by both scholarly and popular individuals and entities is being accorded the struggle against the English-language interference upon Spanish, lest a *Mischsprache* (known popularly as 'Spanglish') might result.

At the same time, efforts to determine the status of variants are impeded by serious gaps in modern dialect research. Although the situation for Spain is probably the most favorable, that of Latin America, as was so ably described by Lope Blanch (1968), is not, because of the vast territories to be covered, chronic financial difficulties, paucity of researchers with up-to-date training, and the like. Boyd Bowman (1970) and García (1968) further supplement the description of the situation, with the latter characterizing the work of Navarro Tomas and other dialectologists as essentially pre-structural. In a similar connection, Diebold (1962) in discussing Mexican and Guatemalan bilingualism, chooses to typify Spanish in those countries as a *lingua franca*, although it appears to this worker that a more appropriate characterization would be 'language of wider communication', a term which also applies to English, along with a number of national varieties throughout the world, as well as lower-order dialects.

Sociolinguistics has, unfortunately, been little developed, although relatively speaking it has, in recent years, been increasing. For example, Uribe Villegas (1970), who heads the Sociolinguistic Project (Proyecto Sociolingüístico) of the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales of the National University of Mexico, has dealt with linguistic problems of Indian groups, while younger scholars such as Georgiana Paulín de Siade, at the same institution, are also interested in Mexican-American speech. An example of the sort of research needed is exemplified by a project undertaken a few years ago, under the joint auspices of the Association for the Inter-American Program in Linguistics and Language Teaching (PILEI) and the Latin American Association for Linguistics and Philology (ALFAL) and the Instituto de Cultura Hispánica in Madrid. An international team including Juan Lope Blanch in Mexico City, Joseph Matluck at the University of Texas at Austin, and Humberto López-Morales at Rice University, Houston, Texas, has begun to investigate different styles in such major cities of the Hispanic world as Caracas, Venezuela; San Juan, Puerto Rico; and Mexico City.

Special mention should however be made of the remarkable sociolinguistic activity at the San Marcos University (Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos) in Lima, Peru, where both United States and Peruvian scholars have, since the mid 1960's, been involved in that government's Plan for Linguistic Development (Plan de Fomento Lingüístico), aimed at providing for bilingual education both in Spanish and Quechua, as well as other native languages. At the same time, the social dialects of Peru's leading languages are receiving attention almost unprecedented in South America.

Finally, in attempting to elaborate the present system, the writer found himself constantly in danger of expanding the parameters to the point that it might become overly comprehensive and cumbersome. One such parameter, finally eliminated, was that of what we were about to term 'performance mode', referring to the manner of production or delivery. Recognizing that this does intersect with the surface realization of language, James Harris (1969:7-9), in his recent transformational treatise on Spanish phonology, divides delivery modes into 'largo' – very slow, 'andante' – moderately slow but still natural, 'allegretto' – moderately casual, and 'presto' – very fast and completely unguarded. He affirms that lacking such a guide as Kenyon and Knott's *Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*, he decided instead to base his study on the speech of 'a few Mexican friends whose speech I believe to be typical of educated speakers from Mexico City', and limiting himself mostly to the 'andante', or moderately slow, and 'allegretto', or moderately fast, but with mention of 'largo' and 'presto' whenever pertinent. To be sure, certain performance factors deserve consideration in any discussion of variability, and the above is an example of how a linguist attempted to 'mark' the factor of speed. In our schema, shown further below, some attempt is made to account for performance or realization factors.

At any rate, a small number of scholars are beginning to address themselves to various aspects of acceptability and standardness as regards Spanish. For example, Jerry R. Craddock of the University of California, Berkeley (1972), in his lexical

analysis of several corpuses of Mexican-American Spanish, within the University of Texas at El Paso's Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism, sets up the following categories: (1) assimilation, (2) blends, and (3) semantic displacement, each with more detailed subdivisions. Addressing himself to the problems involved in enterprises of this sort, he declares:

> . . . it is well-known that the greatest shortcoming of almost all dictionaries lies in the abstractness of their definitions; there is at present no feasible way to designate the full range of permissible usage (i.e., syntactic environments) . . . Even though the field worker must rely to a certain extent on the reactions of native speakers, he soon discovers a rather broad area of latitude or indecision that often leaves the question of well-formedness in abeyance.

The general tenor of his statement, we feel, is applicable well beyond lexical issues.

Recently Ornstein (1972) proposed a taxonomy for classifying nonstandard phonological, grammatical and other variants. This is based on four dimensions, each with two binary or diametrically opposed possibilities.

At this juncture, our proposed notational system is offered immediately below. At the same time it is hoped that, through discussion by colleagues, it may become increasingly applicable to language situations throughout the world.

A TENTATIVE SOCIOLINGUISTIC NOTATIONAL SYSTEM[2]

SYMBOL	EXPLANATION	MARKEDNESS
ST	standard	-
fo	formal, prescriptive, normative, often of 'school variety', careful, deliberate	±
sa	sanctioned by recognized authority (academy, etc.)	±
na	national	±
of	official	±
ac	acrolect(al), higher prestige variety[3]	±
sti	stilted	+
NO	nonstandard	+
ar	argot, slang, caló, jargon, patois, 'street variety'[4]	+
ba	basilect(al), lower prestige, positively stigmatized	+

[2]It would be impossible within this corpus to enumerate all possible influences contributing to the devising of this phonemic inventory, except where adoption of a term or concept calls for this. A number of the terms obviously have long been in use in our field, although even here different nuances of usage by linguists are regrettably too vast a topic for our scope. It is mostly in its aspiration to a discrete system that the notational inventory may have merit, and even then it needs further refining.

[3]The term 'acrolect' and its opposite 'basilect' have been contributed by Stewart (1968).

[4]'Street variety' was suggested to me by Charles G. Elerick, of the University of Texas at El Paso (Ornstein 1971:357).

(SYMBOL)	(EXPLANATION)	(MARKEDNESS)
cd	contactual or bilingual dialect[5], interferential variety	+
if	interferential feature[6], not necessarily assimilated within bilingual community	+
af	assimilated feature[7], integrated within bilingual community	+
bl	blend, feature or item combining inputs from two or more languages or dialects	+
lo	loan feature or item[8]	±
ss	semantic shift, feature or item revealing change in meaning from ST language	+
ru	rustic, rural	+
hy	hypercorrect, to point of non-standardness	+
NE	neutral	± or ——
la	language	±
di	dialect(al)	±
le	lect or 'isolect' (replacing dialect?)[9]	±
va	variety	±
ve	vernacular, 'unmonitored' styles of speech[10]	±
cr	creole	±
pi	pidgin	±
st	style, code, register. Write: st + (designation)	±
re	regional, geographically determined. Write first 2 letters of country or region, first 3 of *la* or *di*, e.g. FR= France, FRE=French	±
so	social (as in 'social dialect')	±
sc	specialized code, e.g., teenagers, occupational	±
hf	high-frequency feature or item	±

[5] 'Contractual dialect' was coined by Haugen (1971), although he had previously suggested 'bilingual dialect' (1969: 72, 370-71).

[6] The dichotomy of 'interferential' versus 'integrated' loans within a bilingual speech community is a concept of Mackey (1962). Nevertheless, rather than 'integrated', we have adopted the term 'assimilated', following Craddock (1972).

[7] The term *af* 'assimilated feature' as well as *bl* 'blend', was adopted from Craddock (1972) in his taxonomy of Southwest Spanish lexicon.

[8] The writer has wished to go beyond the merely lexical suggestivity of Haugen's 'loanword' and 'loanshift' (Haugen 1956: 55 ff.), hence preferring *lo* 'loan feature' and *ss* 'semantic shift'.

[9] C. J. Bailey, Georgetown University, proposes that since 'dialect is unacceptable to so many, it be replaced by 'isolect', which is G. B. Milner's term, or merely 'lect', apparently first used by him and A. A. Afendras (Bailey 1971 *passim*).

[10] Labov defines vernacular as 'the style in which the minimum attention is given to the monitoring of speech' (1970: 46 ff.).

(SYMBOL)	(EXPLANATION)	(MARKEDNESS)
lf	low-frequency feature or item	±
un	unstable, fluctuating, neologistic, disappearing, etc.	±
su	status uncertain, lacking further data	+ or ——
ch	changing, shifting, indicate direction with arrow ←→	±
vu	vulgar	±
po	pornographic, obscene, scatological	±
jo	jocose, 'wordplay' (transposed phonotactics, etc.; e.g. Pig Latin)	±
arc	archaic	±
ob	obsolete or obsolescent	±
qu-	quasi	±
SES	socioeconomic status. Write: SES + (designation)	——
ag	age group. Write: ag + (designation)	——
se	sex. Write se + (designation)	——
co	context. Write co + (designation)	——
RM	realization or performance modes and factors	——
or	(principally) oral usage	——
wr	(principally) written usage	——
sp	speed of delivery. Write: sp + (designation)	——
gr	graphemically, i.e., 'realized in conventional orthography as'. Write: gr + (item)	——

A few observations of the above system, whose use will be briefly illustrated in our following section, ought to suffice. First of all, as will have been noted, the pattern followed is for the most part a digraphemic one, representing either the first two letters of a one-word term, or the first letters of a two-word term. This has almost inevitably had to be waived in certain cases where this pattern would have led to ambiguity, and a triliteral solution was sought, as in 'interferential' in which the recourse was to seek a second letter further in the word with some phonological suggestivity. In the case of socioeconomic status, *SES* is already widely in use in the social sciences.

Aside from this, the inventory of items admittedly does include several dimensions, which like sociolinguistics itself, intersect with other areas. It is also longer than was anticipated originally, and would doubtless benefit by reduction, but only after further feedback from colleagues is received. The ideal would, of course, be a common and international acceptance of this or a system with the same aims, which might be submitted to the proper entities concerned with standardization of international terminology.

Finally, in the above connection, modern technology might also be brought into play to help record very significant changes of status of the components of human

languages, particularly concerning vernacular styles. Lenders (1971) has, for example, expressed his dissatisfaction with the 'static' nature of most lexicons, and suggests instead 'dynamic' ones, which never assume final form. These would exist only on magnetic tapes or discs, and change constantly according to varying linguistic contexts or, for our purpose, determinations of status. He cites as a model the 'cumulative dictionary' being developed at the Institute for Communications Research and Phonetics at the University of Bonn. The same could be done for grammar and syntax, in an attempt to describe the sociolinguistic constraints upon its rules.

D. *Application of the notational system at various levels.* In the present portion of this essay, an attempt will be made to apply our tentative marking proceeding from higher to lower levels, although not above the tagmemic clause structure:

1. **The clause.** An example of application at this level may be seen in several variants of the following durational construction. The first, which is generally acceptable, and of high frequency, is:

(1) (ST, fo) *Hace dos años que (yo) estudio francés*
Durational Sbj Pred DO
'I have been studying French for two years.'

A more refined analysis would be:

Sbj + Pred: *llevar* + Dur (– *hace . . . que*) + Act (Vfinite → Ger)
Dur⁀⟨Sbj⟩⁀Pred₁⁀X → ⟨Sbj⟩

In the above, it is a question of a durational tagmeme, followed by an optional subject, a predicate, and *X* standing for any additional tagmemes, which in this case happens to be a direct object.

Alternating pretty much with (1) throughout the nineteen countries of the Spanish-speaking world, is the construction:

(2) (ST, fo) *(Yo) llevo dos años estudiando francés*
(Sbj) Pred Temporal Action DO
'I have been studying French for two years.'

This can be more precisely analyzed as follows:

Pred ∴ *llevar*⁀Durational (– *hace . . . que*)

Proceeding further we find another high frequency variant in the Mexican construction:

(3) (ST, in, ME) *(Yo) tengo dos años de estudiar francés*
Sbj Pred Temporal Action DO

(4) (ST, in, ME) *(Yo)* $\left\{\begin{matrix} tengo \\ llevo \end{matrix}\right\}$ *dos años de estudiar francés*
Sbj Pred Temporal Action X

or better:

Alt. Mex. → ⟨Sbj⟩⁀Pred; $\left[\begin{matrix} llevar \\ tener \end{matrix}\right]$⁀Dur (– *hace . . . que*)

⁀Act: $\text{Pred}_1 \rightarrow \begin{matrix} de + Inf \\ \text{Ger} \end{matrix}$⁀X

A pair of high-frequency variants may be seen in the existential clause type, of which the standard, formal construction in non-present analogs is unique, because the Predicate is always a third person singular form of *haber* 'to have, there to be'. Thus:

(5) (ST, fo) *Había* *muchos hombres allí*
Pr_{exist} + Nom Comp ± Loc
'There were many men there.'

In the above, then, we have an existential Predicate, followed by a Nominal Complement,[11] and an optional and peripheral locative. Actually, the symbol for 'standard' would not always be necessary since this should be taken for granted unless one wishes to contrast several possibilities.

An alternate form also exists which is so widespread in the Spanish-speaking world that it can be classified as 'Standard informal' and might be analyzed as:

(6) (ST, in) *Habían* *muchos hombres allí*
$Pr_{intr_{x(c)}}$ + Sbj pl ± Loc

or: 'Predicate intransitive, subscript *x* for variation or variant, plus Subject, plural, plus peripheral locative'. We would add that the latter represents a different allosyntagma of the intransitive clause type because the Subject must follow the Predicate.

The above dichotomy is also analogically extended to the rest of the paradigm, except for invariant *hay* 'there is, there are'. Hence: *había habían* (conditional), *habrá habrán* (future), and so on. The above moreover resembles such constructions in Spanish as:

Sobraban muchos hombres 'There were many men to spare.'
Faltaban muchos hombres 'Many men were lacking.'

but is different because the latter can be constructed with an Indirect Object, impossible in the former. Blansitt (1970) has termed such a construction 'semitransitive'.

The above example presented few problems since the informal variant was of very high frequency, seemingly cutting across all socioeconomic strata of speakers, geographic localities, and most conversational situations. Both members of the variable pair were in effect variants along a continuum or axis of standardness.

Badly needed, of course, are grammatical frequency studies, as well as usage attitude investigations, which would help us go beyond impressionistic concepts, no matter how reliable. As indicated previously, these are particularly lacking for Spanish.

2. **Phrase-level structures.** A few examples at this level ought to suffice. Again here we are paying particular attention to Mexican Spanish, and will later also concern ourselves with phenomena from the Mexican-American variety of the language.

In accordance with our practice in this paper, the point of departure will be something approaching a Spanish Peninsular 'base form', useful for analytical pur-

[11] We are not suggesting that Nominal Complement would be a tagmeme in a definitive grammar, but are merely avoiding its classification as a subject or object.

poses:

(7) (ST, fo, SP) *(Nosotros) entramos en la estación*
Sbj Pred Directional
'We're going into the station.'

Throughout Latin America and the Southwestern United States, nevertheless, a different construction obtains, virtually without exception, as far as we know:

(8) (ST, fo, LA, US_{SW}) *(Nosotros) entramos a la estación*
'We're going into the station.'

In the above example, by contrast, we are in the presence of a directional relationship. It occurs that it is functionally analogous to the prepositional governance of any verb of motion, or better locomotion.

Let us, at this point, offer still another instance. Here again directionality is involved:

(9) (ST, fo, SP) *(Ellos) van al médico*
Sbj Pred relator DO
'They're going to the doctor'

This may also be expressed in Spain by such constructions as:

(10) *(Ellos) van donde el médico*

In Mexico, nevertheless, a standard informal usage of the highest frequency is:

(11) (ST, in, ME, US_{SW}) *(ellos) van con el médico*
Sbj Pred Relator DO
'They're going to the doctor.'

As can be observed, our (11) reveals a non-prescriptive substitution of the 'relator of accompaniment' for a 'relator of directionality'. This is, incidentally, still another example of the need to penetrate beyond the surface plane of taxonomic classification to the deeper semantic structure. Such interchangeabilities, particularly of so-called function words invite much more analysis of this nature, and particularly in-depth treatment. Finally, we may offer the following:

(12) (S, fo, SP) *(Ella) en veces toma café*
Sbj Iterative Pred DO
'She sometimes takes (drinks) coffee.'

A parallel construction in Mexico is, however:

(13) (NO, in, ME) *(Ella) en veces toma café*
Sbj Iterative Pred DO
'She sometimes takes (drinks) coffee.'

Again here we are troubled with the lack of usage studies, since, from our direct observation, both in Mexico and the U. S. Southwest, even those speakers who mostly use *en veces* sometimes vascillate under their awareness that this is a non-standard form. Persons of at least grade school education, informally queried about

this, have almost unfailingly reported that only *a veces* is 'correct'. *Mutatis mutandis*, predominantly standard speakers, in shifting to an informal code or style, have been heard to make considerable use of the somewhat stigmatized *en veces*.

Another example will be offered, here again taken from Mexican usage and apparently not uncommon in Guatemala and other Central American countries:

(15) (S, fo, SP) *un poco de agua*
'a little water'

The more common variant, in the majority of styles would, however, be:

(16) (S, in, ME) *una poca de agua*

It ought to be remarked here that the very shape of the quantifier violates a constraint of prescriptive grammar. The form would be 'unacceptable' and lacking well-formedness to highly prescriptive Mexican speakers. At any rate, this seems to us yet another instance of the importance of noting variants which are often indicators of changes which have found the widest currency, but which may still lack formal sanction, particularly for written styles. For such cases 'Standard informal', accompanied by geographical notation, ought to be helpful nomenclature for observers of synchronic change in languages. In any event, our analysis is as follows:

(15)	(S, fo, SP)	*un*		*poco*		*de*	*agua*	
		Det	+	Quant	+	Prep	N	
		x1		x masc			x fem	
(16)	(S, in, ME)	*una*		*poca*		*de*	*agua*	
		Det	+	Quant	+	Prep	N	
		x2		x fem			x fem	

The second alternative, therefore, shows a constraint in its use in that it must be followed by a feminine head noun, otherwise, the first construction would be employed. Hence for masculine head nouns, as far as we know, there is no sociolinguistic regional or social variation in Mexican usage.

It might be commented as well, that the construction of (15) and (16) is structurally a phrase although its typical use is only as an included or backlooping phrase in a host Noun Phrase. Moreover, the use of subscripts employing well-known grammatical and linguistic abbreviations necessitates no additions to our notational system which we would prefer to reduce rather than amplify.

3. **Word level.** At least up until recently, classical tagmemicists have been almost exclusively concerned with structure. Accordingly meaning has been assumed to be a part of the grammar, or better as an underlying component of grammar. In so doing, however, it appears to us that significant aspects of language have been neglected. Whatever the model followed, nevertheless, present-day interest in deep structures and in various types of semantic studies, particularly as expressed through generative semantics, have begun to effect an important shift in this regard.

Our first example is taken from the morphology of the verb, and, in this case, particularly the first person plural of the present subjunctive (assumed here as a base

form on which other analogous markers are built within the paradigm of the Spanish verb). Throughout the Spanish-speaking world the standard construction is as follows:

(17) (ST, fo) *(El) quiere que hablemos más bajo*
Sbj Pred Rel Pred Modal
'He wants us to speak lower.'

In the Spanish of Mexico and the U. S. Southwest, nevertheless, the following non-standard variant is heard with considerable frequency:

(18) (NO, ru, Age: older) *(El) quiere que háblemos más bajo*
'He wants us to speak lower.'

We may observe in (18) that there is a regressive shift of stress, presumably under strong analogy or influence from the overwhelmingly more numerous forms thus accented in the paradigm (*háble, hábles, háble,* etc.). Sociolinguistically, however, the variant is not highly stigmatized, but felt more as a rustic, low prestige form of speakers in rural, often isolated areas, and with older age speakers.

Still another variant is, however, basilectal and unfailingly identified with persons of lower socio-economic status, hence of limited or no formal education:

(19) (NO, ba, SES: lower, ME, US_{SW}) *(El) quiere que háblenos más bajo*
Sbj Pred Rel Pred Modal

It appears almost certain that here too, the *nos* is explainable by analogy, in this instance to other personal pronouns in the system beginning with the nominative case *nosotros* and the objective case *nos.*

Although lexical markings are no novelty, particularly in dictionaries, their use in the framework presented here would seem to add some sociolinguistic dimensions normally taken for granted. Such a stigmatized noun as *pader* 'wall', a metathesized reflex of standard *pared,* common apparently throughout the entire Hispanic world, might be treated lexically either as a separate entry, cross-referenced to the standard form, or merely listed as a variant for the same equivalent:

(20) (NO, ba, hf) *pader* ~ (St, fo) *pared* 'wall'

In the above, one takes the standard as base, although this is merely one way of handling it, and lexicons must respond to their own special needs.

Turning finally to the speech area where the writer and colleagues are studying the Spanish and English bilingual dialects of Mexican-Americans, as well as the Spanish of the immediately adjacent Mexican borderland, a system like ours appears to be particularly applicable. This is, of course, no different than similar contact situations, and the low-prestige status of the contactual dialects has discouraged scholarly treatment and analysis of the potentially available corpuses.

We will now treat several items which have been gleaned from research within the framework of the University of Texas at El Paso's Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism:

(21) (ST, na, ME, di, US_{SW}) *camión* 'bus'

In the above, the point is that rather than *autobús,* the standard equivalent employed

in Spain and elsewhere, the Mexican national term is *camión*, serving also for the U. S. Southwest, where we may consider it dialectal. One of the main reasons for the latter decision is that, oddly enough, for both monolingual and bilingual learners of Spanish in this region, schools have almost exclusively employed texts reflecting Peninsular Spanish for structure and vocabulary, even though phonology has followed Spanish American patterns, so that regional phenomena have not found formal acceptance. The next item is:

(22) (qu-ST, inf, ME, di, US_{SW}) *droga* 'debt'

which, despite its high frequency, still appears to be a dialectalism although hardly at all stigmatized.

Our next example reflects a meaning shift, a common result of intensive language contact:

(23) (NO, cd, ss, hf, US_{SW}, SPA ← Eng. *attend*) *atender* 'to attend'

which can be rewritten as: nonstandard Spanish, contactual dialect, reshaped morphophonemically to be congruent with the Spanish conjugational system under obvious influence of structural cognate similarity, and with semantic shift. A more complex case is:

(24) (NO, cd, ss, jo?, su, US_{SW}, SPA ← Eng. *grocer*) *grosero* 'grocery man'

The above differs from (23) in that there is reasonable doubt concerning the status of this item, hence, 'status uncertain', in part because it appears to be used humorously by some, while for others it is employed with all seriousness. It needs to be explained here that in *ST* Spanish *grosero* = 'vulgar'.

The universals of interference resulting from extensive language contact remain to be systematically studied and ordered. One of the most persistent phenomena is, of course, the mixing which occurs, some of which is productive of new items or features, and some of which is merely ephemeral. Hence:

(25) (NO, cd, bl, if, su, US_{SW}, SPA ← Eng. *advantage* + SPA *ventaja*) *adventaja* 'advantage'

In the above, gleaned from one Mexican-American informant's written composition, it is not certain whether this was idiolectal or whether it might have been a one-time occurrence, with little likelihood of repetition by that same individual, hence the apparent usefulness, it appears to us, of both *if* 'interferential feature', and *su* 'status uncertain' designations.

The impact of American English technical terminology and mass consumer products, as well as specialized social institutions is, naturally, overwhelming in certain domains. Although a few miles from El Paso, across the U. S./Mexican border a *ST SPA* term *parabrisas* is available, the following is almost exclusively heard here:

(26) (NO, cd, lo, af, US_{SW}, SPA) /wínšil/ 'windshield'

in which, it goes without saying, rephonemicization occurs, with consonant cluster reduction, shortening of vowel length and the like.

Similarly, one observes:

(27) (NO, cd, lo, af, US_{SW}, SPA) /suera/ 'sweater'

where virtually the same remarks apply, except that the alveolar flap /t/ is realized with a similar Spanish flap /ɾ/. It may be noted, also, that in Spain itself, the equivalent tends to be /xersi/ (gr. *Jersey)* and less commonly *suéter,* listed in many dictionaries as the *ST* term also in the Mexico City area. Students writing compositions in Spanish classes here realize the word either as *suera* or *sweater.*

Another type of loan item, however, is that where, although some sort of *ST SPA* equivalent may exist or a translation could be rendered, the results would impede rather than facilitate communication in the bilingual speech community. Accordingly:

(28) (ST, lo, af, US_{SW}, SPA) *School Board*

In this instance, without touching upon the different phonological realizations dependent upon the speaker's English competence, it is almost superfluous to insist that a translation such as *Consejo de ciudadanos para las escuelas públicas* (Committee of Citizens for Public Schools) would fail the test of intelligibility and usefulness alike. As a result, this must be considered a *ST* loan.

Understandably, professional communicators such as Mexican-American politicians, announcers, and salesmen, often opt for *NO* items even if they know the *ST* perfectly well, to avoid unnecessary distance between themselves and their interlocutors.

At this point, let us address ourselves to one of the thorniest problems in American Spanish, represented by the status of the Pachuco argot. This developed about the time of World War II as a secret code among youthful El Paso deviant elements, but by now much if not most of its colorful lexical content has undergone diffusion into informal styles of Southwest Spanish (and to some extent in Mexico) among younger males as active, and among females as passive, idiolectal components of linguistic repertoires. A few examples are offered:

(29) (NO, ar-Pachuco, ba, se-M, US_{SW}, ME, PA) *ranfla* 'auto, car, jalopy'

(30) (NO, ar-Pachuco, se-M, co-peers, US_{SW}, ME) *refinar* 'to eat'

It should not be necessary, particularly where a series of related items are presented within the same corpus, to include all possible markings since many are so implicational that it is superfluous. Rather we recommend that different symbols be inserted as one goes along, so that the total picture will become clear. In the above, for instance, we chose to include the peer-group context in which this stigmatized item would be used, since in many Mexican-American families use of such a term would be strictly taboo in the presence of parents and elders. The final item, slightly different in status is:

(31) (NO, ar-Pachuco, su, US_{SW}, ME) *huisa* 'girl, gal'

The item, it appears, is fluctuating in usage, unknown to many teenage speakers. Manuel Pacheco, University of Colorado, a native New Mexican, notes (conversation 1972) that the term is widespread in the New Mexican Spanish dialect. It should be

pointed out that in the Southwest, two major dialects exist (cf. Ornstein 1970 for discussion of Southwest Spanish Koine vs. the New Mexico-Southern Colorado variety).

Not wishing to slight phonology, we take the example of a high-frequency variant of /č/ (graphemically *ch*) in Southwest Spanish and occurring in other parts of the Hispanic world:

(32) (NO, cd, hf, ba, SPA, US_{SW}, ME, PA) /mušäša/ ~ (ST, fo, SES-higher, st-careful, SPA, US_{SW}, ME, PA) /mučača/ *muchacha* 'girl'

In this example, we are signalling that in the U. S. Southwest, Mexico, and Panama, both realizations occur, with differentiation being by socioeconomic factors. The right-hand 'standard' pronunciation is largely limited to upper-strata speakers, and even here mostly in careful style. For the majority of speakers of the Mexican-American contactual dialect, however, the left-hand pronunciation is the norm, albeit quite stigmatized. For them, the change has already taken place.

An example particularly apt for reflecting synchronic changes is taken from Argentinian Spanish, where a shift of the voiced lamino-palatal groove sibilant /ž/ to the voiceless /š/ counterpart is occurring, particularly among younger generation speakers in Buenos Aires.

(33) (ST, hf, ag-younger, AR, SPA) /kaše/ ← (ST, ch, ag-older, AR, SPA) /kaže/ *calle* 'street'

Finally, our system would appear to be particularly applicable wherever large-scale changes are in progress, as for example Danish, in which virtually the entire vocalic system is undergoing a shift toward openness.[12]

(34) (ST, DA) /køsd/ ← (ST, DA, ch, sti, hy) /kysd/ *kyst* 'bush'

In the above, we have indicated a change in progress in the direction signalled by the arrow, implying that the left-hand realization tends, at least, to seem stilted and hypercorrect. In conclusion, whatever may be the shortcomings of this tentative system, enough has been presented to suggest that it may exhibit the potential of providing a great deal of both the linguistic and the extra-linguistic information needed to interpret changes in progress and their direction.

E. *Some implications for further investigations.* Work on this paper, and related activity of the Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism at the University of Texas at El Paso, indicate strongly that divergence appears to occur much more frequently at the lower tagmemic levels, especially at that of the phrase and word. It is not accidental, therefore, that interference studies have tended to focus on the lexicon. Similarly, it is also true that very little has been done to investigate what are the universals of bilingual and bidialectal contact behavior. Is it possible to identify some of the apparent conditions which bring about variants, including the role of bilingual or bidialectal contact?

A further problem is the interrelationship of variance in surface forms with the

[12] I am indebted to Prof. Søren Egerod, University of Copenhagen, for comments on Danish phonology.

processes of linguistic change. What are the factors that bring about the emergence of one form over another, aside from the prescriptive force of sociopolitical considerations? How can one explain seemingly capricious disappearances often of high-frequency forms rather than of low-frequency ones? Similarly, does semological change, particularly in the lexicon, follow 'universal' tendencies emic in nature, rather than etic?

It appears to us that whether one accepts the tagmemic model or others, an urgent need exists for notational systems reflecting the sociolinguistic constraints on the use of varying and competing language forms. Could such systems not help analyze tendencies in the processes of change far better than the retrospective and intuitive approaches still predominant today?

It seems to us that a chronic deterrent as regards the analysis of synchronic (and even diachronic) changes has been the tendency to concentrate upon unitary forms, and the failure to flag or indicate variants. Outside of strongly formal and normative contexts, many of these variants will actually be of higher frequency than the more prestigious forms. Linguistic corpuses, one might say, take on the shapes of rather artificial and idealized masses or bodies of 'data', which are intended more for the convenience of the analyst than for revealing the realities of language usage.

The relatively unexplored potential of bilingual and bidialectal corpuses is at long last becoming a valid and respectable object of scholarly investigation. Not a sociolinguist, but an eminent scholar of Sanskrit and general linguistics, M. B. Emeneau has written (1962:42):

> 'Language mixture', i.e., structural borrowing is not a monstrosity or an impossibility. It occurs. There is surely much more evidence of it to be recognized and added to the small amount of certain instances that we may now operate with. To be sure, the only really valid evidence is that derived from bilingual situations in which the languages on both sides are well known. It will not do to deal in substrata that have long vanished entirely from our control.

In conclusion, it is possible that one of the best ways of counteracting the unitary bias, is to incorporate more sociolinguistic data about linguistic phenomena, through systems of marking. These hopefully might even gain international acceptance and facilitate research by multi-national scholarly teams. The need to probe the third dimension between unquestioned 'standardness' and outright nonstandardness is, moreover, a task needing, as well, the insights of workers in the field following other models, such as the stratificational one, which are also attracting growing attention.

Fortunately, there are unmistakable indications today that, whatever their philosophic differences, linguistic schools are converging upon sociolinguistics in their desire to account for societal factors in human speech. It was not accidental, therefore, that case theorist, Charles Fillmore, entitled his 1972 address at Georgetown University 'A Grammarian Looks to Sociolinguistics'. Language occurs not in a logico-mathematical vacuum but in variable changing contexts, and hence is itself variable and changing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, Charles-James N. 1970. 'The Integration of Linguistic Theory: Internal Reconstruction and the Comparative Method in Descriptive Linguistics'. (U. of Hawaii, Dept. of Linguistics, *Working Papers in Linguistics* 2.93-102.) Also in R. P. Stockwell, ed., *Historical Linguistics in the Perspective of Generative Grammar.* Bloomington: Indiana U. Press.

Bailey, Charles-James N. 1971. *Variation and Language Theory.* (Unpublished monograph presented at the Summer Institute of the LSA, 1971, SUNY Buffalo, July 20-23, in Advanced Survey of Contemporary Issues in Sociolinguistics.)

Baratz, Joan C. 1970. 'Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System'. In Frederick Williams, ed., *Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme,* 11-24. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

Bernstein, Basil. 1970. 'A Sociolinguistic Approach to Socialization, with Some Reference to Educability'. In Williams, ed., *Language and Poverty,* 25-61.

Bishop, Morris. 1969. 'Good Usage, Bad Usage and Usage'. In William Morris, ed., *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language,* xxi-xxiv. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co. and Houghton Mifflin.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. 'Introductory Remarks'. In E. L. Blansitt, Jr., ed., Report of the Eighteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, 11-12. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. 1967. 'Sentence and Clause in Universal Grammar'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 12 (April) 112-21.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. 1972. 'Cognitive Tagmemics'. Unpublished manuscript.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr., and Jacob Ornstein. 1969. 'Tagmemics and String Grammar'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 11 (June) 67-76.

Boyd-Bowman, Peter. 1970. Review of Sebeok *Current Trends in Linguistics IV. Language* 46.189-92.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Coates, William A. 1966. 'A Framework for the Description of Linguistic Behavior Episodes'. *Linguistics* 27.26-48.

Cook, Walter A. 1964. *On Tagmemes and Transforms.* Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Craddock, Jerry R. 1972. *Lexical Analysis of Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism (SSSB) Bilingual Corpuses: Dialectal Traits and Chief Interference Patterns.* Monograph prepared for The Cross-Cultural Southwest Ethnic Study Center, University of Texas, El Paso.

De Camp, David. 1970. 'Is a Sociolinguistic Theory Possible'. In J. A. Alatis, ed., *Linguistics and Teaching of Standard English to Speakers of Other Languages or Dialects,* 157-74. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 22: 20th Annual Round Table.) Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Diebold, A. Richard Jr. 1962. 'Mexican and Guatemalan Bilingualism'. In Frank A. Rice, ed., *Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, 26-33. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1963. 'Morphemic Analysis of the Spanish Verb'. *Filología Moderna* 13 (Oct.) 53-58.

Emeneau, M. B. 1962. 'Bilingualism and Structural Borrowing'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106.430-42.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1968. 'An Analysis of the Interaction of Language Topic and Listener'. In J. A. Fishman, ed., *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, 192-211. The Hague: Mouton.

Fasold, Ralph W. 1970. 'Two Models of Socially Significant Variation'. *Language* 46.551-73.

Fasold, Ralph W. 1971. 'Minding Your Z's and D's: Distinguishing Syntactic and Phonological Variable Rules'. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.*

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. 'Diglossia'. *Word* 15.325-40.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1962. 'The Language Factor in National Development'. In Rice, ed., *Study of the Role of Second Languages*, 1-14.

Fernández Naranjo, Nicolás, and Dora Gómez de Fernández. 1967. *Diccionario de Bolivianismos.* 2nd ed. La Paz, Bolivia: Editorial 'Los Amigos del Libro'.

Fillmore, Charles. 1972. 'A Grammarian Looks to Sociolinguistics'. Georgetown University Round Table, March 1972.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1970. *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. (Especially 37-56.)

Fishman, Joshua A., Robert L. Cooper, and Roxana Ma. 1968. *Bilingualism in the Barrio.* (No. OEC-1-7-0628-17-0279.) Washington, D. C.: Office of Education.

Fishman, Joshua A., C. A. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta, eds. 1968. *Language Problems of Developing Nations.* New York: Wiley.

Fries, Charles C., and Kenneth L. Pike. 1949. 'Coexistent Phonemic Systems'. *Language* 25.29-50.

Fries, Peter. 1971. Review of W. A. Cook *Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis. Language Sciences* 17 (Oct.) 45-50.

Fries, Peter. 1972. 'Tagmemics'. In Clark, Eschholz and Rosa, eds., *Language: Introductory Readings.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fries, Peter. 1972. 'Problems in the Description of the English Noun Phrase'. Paper presented at the XIth International Congress of Linguists, Bologna, Italy.

García, Erica. 1968. 'Spanish Phonology'. In T. A. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics IV: Ibero-American and Caribbean Linguistics*, 63-83. The Hague: Mouton.

Garfinkel, H. 1968. *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, Erving. 1972. *Relations in Public Microstudies in Public Order.* New York: Basil Books.

Guitarte, Guillermo L., and Rafael Torres Quintero. 1968. 'Linguistic Correctness and the Role of the Academies'. In Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics*, 562-604.

Gumperz, John J. 1967. 'Linguistic Repertoires, Grammar and Second Language Instruction'. In C. W. Kreidler, ed., *Report of the 16th Round Table Meeting* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 18.), 81-90. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Gumperz, John J. 1969. 'Communication in Multilingual Societies'. In S. A. Tyler, ed., *Cognitive Anthropology*, 435-49. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Halliday, Michael A. K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Strevens. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harris, James. 1969. *Spanish Phonology*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1956. *Bilingualism in the Americas*. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1969. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Second edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1971. 'The Ecology of Language'. *Linguistic Reporter*. Supplement 25 (Winter) 19-26.

Haugen, Einar. 'Bilingualism, Language Contact and Immigrant Languages in the U. S. A.: Research Report 1956-70'. In T. A. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics X*. The Hague: Mouton.

Hill, A. A. 1969. Review of Quirk and Svartvik *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability*. *Language* 45.622-4.

Hill, A. A. 1970. 'Laymen, Lexicographers and Linguists'. *Language* 46.245-58.

Hoss, Norman. 1969. 'Guide to the Dictionary'. In Morris, ed., *The American Heritage Dictionary*, xli-xlix.

Householder, Fred W. 1969. Review of Langacker *Language and Its Structure*. *Language* 45.886-97.

Hymes, Dell H. 1962. 'The Ethnography of Speaking'. In T. Gladwin and W. C. Sturtevant, eds., *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, 15-53. Washington, D. C.: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Hymes, Dell H. 1967. 'Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting'. *Journal of Social Issues* 23.8-28.

Ivić, Pavle. 1966. Discussion of Gumperz 'On the Ethnology of Linguistic Change'. In William Bright, ed., *Sociolinguistics*, 39 ff. The Hague: Mouton.

Jakobovits, Leon A. 1971. 'Preliminaries to the Psychology of Ordinary Language'. W. Brewer and L. A. Jakobovits, eds., *Revolution in Psychological Theory*.

John, Vera P. 1970. Response to Harry Osser 'Developmental Studies in Communicative Competence'. In Smith and Shuy (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*, 31-34.

John, Vera P., and Vivian M. Horner. 1970. 'Bilingualism and the Spanish-Speaking Child'. In Williams, ed., *Language and Poverty*, 140-52.

Joos, Martin. 1962. *The Five Clocks*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kany, Charles E. 1945. *American Spanish Syntax*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.

Kany, Charles E. 1960. *American Spanish Semantics.* Berkeley: U. of California Press.

Labov, William A. 1966. *The Stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, William A. 1970. 'The Study of Language in its Social Context'. *Studium Generale* 23.30-87.

Labov, William A., P. Cohen, C. Robins, and J. Lewis. 1968. *A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City.* (Cooperative Research Project 3288.) Washington, D. C.: Office of Education.

Lenders, W. 1968. 'Static and Dynamic Lexical Systems'. In G. E. Perren and J. L. M. Trim, eds., *Applications of Linguistics, Selected Papers of the 2nd International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge, 1969,* 313-17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liêm Nguyễn Dăng. 1966. *English Grammar: A Combined Tagmemic and Transformational Approach.* Canberra, Australia: Linguistic Circle of Canberra Publications.

Longacre, Robert E. 1968. *Grammar Discovery Procedures.* The Hague: Mouton.

Longacre, Robert E. 1970. 'Sentence Structure as a Statement Calculus'. *Language* 46.

Lope Blanch, Juan M. 1968. 'Hispanic Dialectology'. In Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics IV,* 106-57.

Mathiot, Madeleine. 1962. 'Noun Classes and Folk Taxonomy in Papago'. *American Anthropologist* 64.340-50.

Mathiot, Madeleine. (forthcoming). *An Approach to the Cognitive Study of Language.*

Mackey, William F. 1962. 'The Description of Bilingualism'. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 7.

Meyerstein, Zlata. 1970. Review of Kelly *Description and Measurement of Bilingualism. Language* 46.984 ff.

McDavid, Raven. 1971. 'Dialect Geography and Social Science Problems'. In Harold B. Allen and Gary N. Underwood, eds., *Readings in American Dialectology,* 357-64. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts and Meridith Corp.

Newman, Stanley. 1968. Review of Law *Obligatory Constructions in Isthmus Nahuat Grammar. Language* 44.189-91.

Ornstein, Jacob. 1970. 'Sociolinguistics and New Perspectives in the Study of Southwest Spanish'. In R. W. Ewton, Jr. and J. Ornstein, eds., *Studies in Language and Linguistics 1969-70,* 127-84. El Paso, Texas: Western Press.

Ornstein, Jacob. 1971. 'Language Varieties Along the U. S.-Mexican Border'. In Perren and Trim, eds., *Applications of Linguistics,* 349-62.

Ornstein, Jacob. 'Toward a Classification of Southwest Spanish Nonstandard Variants'. (Presented at the 32nd Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, 1970.) Also in *Linguistics* 1972: 93.71-92.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1960. 'Toward a Theory of Change and Bilingualism'. *Studies in*

Linguistics 15.1-7.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1966. 'A Guide to Publications Related to Tagmemic Theory'. In T. A. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics III: Theoretical Foundations*, 365-93. The Hague: Mouton.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1967. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior.* The Hague: Mouton.

Quirk, Randolph, and Jan Svartvik. 1966. *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability.* The Hague: Mouton.

Rubin, Joan. 1968. *National Bilingualism in Paraguay.* The Hague: Mouton.

Sacks, H. 1969. 'The Search for Help'. In D. Sudnow, ed., *Studies in Social Interaction.* New York: MacMillan.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1968. 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings'. In H. Garfinkel and H. Sacks, eds., *Contributions in Ethnomethodology.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Shuy, Roger W. 1970. 'The Sociolinguists and Urban Language Problems'. In Williams, ed., *Language and Poverty*, 335-50.

Shuy, Roger W., Walter A. Wolfram, and William K. Riley. 1968. *Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study.* Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Smith, David M., and Roger W. Shuy, eds. 1972. *Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis.* Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Stewart, William A. 1965. 'Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English'. In R. W. Shuy, ed., *Social Dialects and Language Learning*, 10-19. Champaign, Illinois: National Council on the Teaching of English.

Stewart, William A. 1968. 'A Sociolinguistic Typology Describing National Multilingualism'. In J. A. Fishman, ed., *Reader in the Sociology of Language*, 531-45.

Taylor, Orlando. 1971. Response to Frederick Williams 'Social Dialects and the Field of Speech'. In Roger W. Shuy, ed., *Sociolinguistics: A Crossdisciplinary Perspective*, 13-20. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Uribe Villegas, Oscar. 1970. *Sociolingüística: Una Introducción a su Estudio.* México D. F.: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Von Raffler Engel, Walburga. 1971. 'Intonational and Vowel Correlates in Contrasting Dialects'. Presented at the VIIth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, University of Montreal.

Von Raffler Engel, Walburga, and C. K. Sigelman. 1971. 'Rhythm, Narration, Description in the Speech of Black and White School Children'. *Language Sciences* (Dec.) 9-14.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact.* New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov, and M. I. Herzog. 1968. 'Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change'. In W. P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel,

eds., *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, 95-195. Austin: U. of Texas Press.

Williams, Frederick. 1970. 'Language, Attitude and Social Change'. In Williams, ed., *Language and Poverty*, 380-99.

Wolfram, Walter. 1969. *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech.* Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wolfram, Walter, Marie Shiels and Ralph W. Fasold. 1971. *Overlapping Influence in the English of Second Generation Puerto Rican Teenagers in Harlem.* (Office of Education Grant No. 3-70-0033 [508].) Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.